

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and before any other amendment if offered by Representative DeLauro of Connecticut or a designee. The amendment is not subject to amendment except for pro forma amendments or to a demand for a division of the question in the committee of the whole or in the House.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5384, AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO OF CONNECTICUT

Page 13, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$25,000,000)”.

Page 36, line 21, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$229,303,000)”.

Page 48, line 26, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$12,000,000)”.

Page 50, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$23,000,000)”.

Page 51, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 52, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$6,697,000)”.

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new sections:

“SEC. _____. In addition to amounts otherwise provided by this Act, there is hereby appropriated to the Secretary the following amounts for the following purposes:

“(1) For biorefinery grants authorized by section 9003 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8103), \$50,000,000.

“(2) For grants under the energy audit and renewable energy development program authorized by section 9005 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 8105), \$10,000,000.

“(3) For payments under the bioenergy program authorized by section 9010 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 8108), and notwithstanding subsection (c)(2) of such section, \$120,000,000.

“(4) For grants under the Biomass Research and Development Initiative authorized by section 307 of the Biomass Research and Development Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 7624), \$14,000,000.

“SEC. _____. In the case of taxpayers with income in excess of \$1,000,000, for the calendar year beginning in 2007, the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of Public Law 107-16, Public Law 108-27, and Public Law 108-311 shall be reduced by 1.21 percent.”.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the

control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4939, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII

and by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. LEWIS of California, YOUNG of Florida, REGULA, ROGERS of Kentucky, WOLF, KOLBE, WALSH, TAYLOR of North Carolina, HOBSON, BONILLA, KNOLLENBERG, OBEY, MURTHA, SABO, MOLLOHAN, OLVER, VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. EDWARDS.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on H. Res. 830, by the yeas and nays;

Adoption of H. Res. 830, if ordered;

Motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 4681, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5384, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 830 on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 194, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—213

Aderholt	Blackburn	Brown-Waite,
Akin	Blunt	Ginny
Alexander	Boehert	Burgess
Bachus	Boehner	Burton (IN)
Baker	Bonilla	Buyer
Barrett (SC)	Bonner	Calvert
Bartlett (MD)	Bono	Campbell (CA)
Barton (TX)	Boozman	Cannon
Bass	Boustany	Cantor
Beauprez	Bradley (NH)	Capito
Biggert	Brady (TX)	Carter
Billirakis	Brown (SC)	Castle
Bishop (UT)		Chabot